U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

(b)(6)

[redacted]

DATE: APR 3 0 2013

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [redacted]

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)(A)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of $630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks classification as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)(A). The director stated that "[t]he petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary met the minimum requirements at the time the Form ETA-9089 was accepted. Therefore, the beneficiary cannot be found to be qualified for the position." The director's decision sufficiently discussed the deficiencies in the petition.

The petitioner asserts in part 3 of Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion:

> We submit this appeal because the submitted credential[] evaluation demonstrates the beneficiary possesses the requisite education for the proffered position. We believe the USCIS officer did not properly consider the evaluation.

The petitioner also indicated on Form I-290B that "My brief and/or additional evidence will be submitted to [the] AAO within 30 days." The appeal was filed on April 26, 2012. As of this date, approximately one year later, the AAO has received nothing further.

A general statement without substantive arguments is insufficient to raise that ground on appeal. The petitioner did not provide any additional evidence or offer any additional arguments identifying any errors of law or fact in the director's analysis such that the AAO could find the appeal to be substantive. *See Desravines v. United States Attorney Gen.*, No. 08-14861, 343 F. App'x 433, 435 (11th Cir. 2009) (finding that issues not briefed on appeal are deemed abandoned).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) provides that "[a]n officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal." In this matter, the petitioner's appellate submission offers only a general statement asserting that the officer "did not properly consider" a piece of evidence in the record. The petitioner offers no argument that demonstrates error on the part of the director based upon the record that was before him.

As the petitioner offers no substantive basis for the filing of the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.